



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/525,707	03/14/2000	Monty M. Denneau	Y0999-493-(8728-334)	9035

7590 05/12/2003

Frank Chau Esq  
F Chau & Associates LLP  
1900 Hempstead Turnpike  
Suite 501  
East Meadow, NY 11554

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/525,707

Applicant(s)

DENNEAU ET AL.

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 10-21 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2143

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 – 21 are presented for examination.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election with traverse of claims 1 – 9 in Paper No. 3 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there is substantial overlapping subject matter between Group I and Group II. In particular, both Groups I and II recite a method for routing packets on a linear array of N processors connected in a nearest neighbor configuration. This is not found persuasive because even though there are few similarities in Groups I and II, the independent claims and some of the dependent claims cover different subject matter that is not disclosed in both groups. Not only are Groups I and II different for reasons stated in the first office action. Group II discloses a “first dummy packet” and a “second dummy packet” with methods of sending these packets. These limitations are not present in any part of Group I.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

#### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the direct and indirect paths must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.
3. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
4. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the wrap around each end processor must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Art Unit: 2143

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

5. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the x-axis, y-axis, and finally z-axis must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

6. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the positive and negative direction must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

7. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the limitation of, "wrapping around a first end processor, proceeding to and wrapping around a second end processor," must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

8. This limitation would make one interpret that an end processor on the far right is connected to an end processor to the far left.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

11. The limitation of “wrap around each end processor” leaves one to believe that the connection to an end processor connects to the other end of the array is not what is disclosed in the specification.

12. Claims 6 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

13. The limitation of, “positive direction,” and/or “negative direction,” is not disclosed in the specification in a way to properly describe the invention.

14. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

15. The limitation of, “wrapping around a first end processor, proceeding to and wrapping around a second end processor,” is not disclosed in the specification in a way to properly describe the invention.

16. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The meaning of the phrase, “second pass” is not described in the specification.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claims 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nugent (5175733) in view of Hayashi et al. (5826033) (hereinafter Hayashi) in further view of Thorson (6055618).

19. Referencing claim 1, as interpreted by the Examiner, Nugent teaches a method for routing packets on a linear array of N processors connected in a nearest neighbor configuration, comprising the steps of:

20. for each axis required to directly route a packet from a source to a destination processor, (e.g. col. 8, lines 40 – 45 & col. 13, line 61 – col. 14, line 18),

21. determining whether a result of directly sending a packet from an initial processor to a target processor is less than or greater than a number of moves, respectively, the initial processor being the source processor in a first axis, the target processor being the destination processor in a last axis, (e.g. col. 8, lines 40 – 45 & col. 13, line 61 – col. 14, line 18);

22. directly sending the packet, when the result is less than a number of moves, (e.g. col. 8, lines 40 – 45 & col. 13, line 61 – col. 14, line 18); and

23. indirectly sending the packet so as to wrap around each end processor, when the result is greater than a number of moves, (e.g. col. 8, lines 40 – 45 & col. 13, line 61 – col. 14, line 18). Nugent does not specifically teach a number of moves equaling  $N/2$ , and

Art Unit: 2143

24. for each end processor of the array, connecting unused outputs to corresponding unused inputs. Hayashi teaches a number of moves equaling  $N/2$ , (e.g. col. 9, lines 27 – 38 & col. 16, lines 29 – 56). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hayashi with Nugent because using algorithms to modify data transmission is a common practice among network devices to make a system more efficient in the manner it transmits data. Therefore, utilizing an algorithm would make a system more efficient in finding that fastest path for data transmission. Hayashi does not specifically teach for each end processor of the array, connecting unused outputs to corresponding unused inputs. Thorson teaches for each end processor of the array, connecting unused outputs to corresponding unused inputs, (e.g. col. 5, line 23 – col. 6, line 17 & Fig. 4). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Thorson with the combine system of Nugent and Hayashi because it would be more efficient for a system to utilize unused ports that could be connected to other ends of the system changing the linear or cube shaped network to a torus, “doughnut” shape that could result in faster transmission of data that is located on the on the further end of the system.

25. Referencing claim 2, Nugent teaches packets are routed along the x-axis, then the y-axis, and finally the z-axis, (e.g. col. 8, lines 40 – 45 & col. 13, line 61 – col. 14, line 18).

26. Referencing claim 3, as interpreted by the Examiner, Nugent does not specifically teach the step of randomly sending the packet using either of said sending steps, when the result is equal to  $N/2$  moves and  $N$  is an even number. Hayashi teaches the step of randomly sending the packet using either of said sending steps, when the result is equal to  $N/2$  moves and  $N$  is an even number, (e.g. col. 9, lines 27 – 38 & col. 16, lines 29 – 56). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hayashi with Nugent because it would be more convenient for the system when the algorithm is equal, it would not

Art Unit: 2143

make a difference in which direction the data was sent because it is equal distance and no matter which way the data is transmitted the data will arrive at the same time.

27. Referencing claim 4, as interpreted by the Examiner, Nugent and Hayashi do not specifically teach said indirectly sending step comprises the step of initially sending the packet in an opposing direction with respect to the target processor, wrapping around a first end processor, proceeding to and wrapping around a second end processor, and proceeding to the target processor. Thorson teach said indirectly sending step comprises the step of initially sending the packet in an opposing direction with respect to the target processor, wrapping around a first end processor, proceeding to and wrapping around a second end processor, and proceeding to the target processor, (e.g. col. 5, line 23 – col. 6, line 17 & Fig. 4). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Thorson with the combine system of Nugent and Hayashi because it would be more efficient and faster for a system to indirectly send the data and have it “wrap around” a processor if the distance of the data traversing an indirect route is shorter then traveling a longer route taking a direct route.

28. Claim5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nugent (5175733) in view of Hayashi (5826033) in further view of Thorson (6055618) in further view of Ganmukhi et al. (6449667) (hereinafter Ganmukhi).

29. Referencing claim 5, as interpreted by the Examiner, Nugent, Hayashi and Thorson do not specifically teach the step of the target processor receiving the packet upon a second pass thereby, when the packet is sent indirectly. Gunmukhi teaches the step of the target processor receiving the packet upon a second pass thereby, when the packet is sent indirectly, (e.g. col. 7, line 11 – col. 8, line 64). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gunmukhi with the combine system of Nugent,



Art Unit: 2143

Hayashi and Thorson because it is common for a network in a tree architecture to pass through a parent node more than once in the transfer of data to and from another network device.

30. Claims 6 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nugent (5175733) in view of Hayashi (5826033) in further view of Thorson (6055618) in further view of Ritter et al. (5570084) (hereinafter Ritter).

31. Referencing claim 6, as interpreted by the Examiner, Nugent, Hayashi and Thorson do not specifically teach the step of adding a 0-bit or a 1-bit to the packet, depending on whether the packet is to be injected into a corresponding axis in the positive or the negative direction, respectively. Ritter teaches the step of adding a 0-bit or a 1-bit to the packet, depending on whether the packet is to be injected into a corresponding axis in the positive or the negative direction, respectively, (e.g. col. 3, lines 22 – 64 & col. 6, line 47 – col. 7, line 14). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Ritter with the combine system of Nugent, Hayashi and Thorson because it would be more efficient for a system to utilize the functionality of a network protocol and place in a header a direction field/bit and attach the header to the packet so other network devices can read the packet header and know which direction to send it to get to its destination.

32. Referencing claim 7, as interpreted by the Examiner, Nugent, Hayashi and Thorson do not specifically teach the packet can only be removed when traveling in the positive direction, if the 0-bit is added thereto. Ritter teaches the packet can only be removed when traveling in the positive direction, if the 0-bit is added thereto, (e.g. col. 3, lines 22 – 64 & col. 6, line 47 – col. 7, line 14). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Ritter with the combine system of Nugent, Hayashi and Thorson because it would be more efficient when a packet reaches a node that ends its travel on an axis and has to travel on another axis to get to its destination node, to have to change the field that determines the direction

Art Unit: 2143

for the packet to travel. Therefore, removing the packet from the header, changing the header information and reattaching the header to the packet so it can be transmitted to the destination node.

33. Referencing claim 8, as interpreted by the Examiner, Nugent, Hayashi and Thorson do not specifically teach the packet can only be removed when traveling in the negative direction, if the 1-bit is added thereto. Ritter teaches the packet can only be removed when traveling in the negative direction, if the 1-bit is added thereto, (e.g. col. 3, lines 22 – 64 & col. 6, line 47 – col. 7, line 14). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Ritter with the combine system of Nugent, Hayashi and Thorson because of similar reasons stated above.

34. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nugent (5175733) in view of Hayashi (5826033) in further view of Thorson (6055618) in further view of Ritter et al. (5570084) (hereinafter Ritter) in further view of Ganmukhi (6449667).

35. Referencing claim 9, as interpreted by the Examiner, Nugent, Hayashi, Thorson and Ritter do not specifically teach the step of placing the packet in a first queue or a second queue, depending on whether the 0-bit or the 1-bit is added to the packet, respectively. Ganmukhi teaches the step of placing the packet in a first queue or a second queue, depending on whether the 0-bit or the 1-bit is added to the packet, respectively, (e.g. cols. 35 – 38). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Ganmukhi with the combine system of Nugent, Hayashi, Thorson and Ritter because it would be more efficient to have separate transmission queue that have a specific function as apposed to having one queue and switching modes every time a different packet enters the queue. Therefore, creating a faster system to transmit data across the network.

### *Conclusion*

Art Unit: 2143

36. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
37. Monacos U.S. Patent No. 5710938 discloses Non-blocking crossbar permutation engine with constant routing latency.
38. Dahl et al. U.S. Patent No. 5710938 discloses Data processing array in which sub-arrays are established and run independently.
39. Suto U.S. Patent No. 6446246 discloses Method and apparatus for detail routing using obstacle carving around terminals.
40. Wilkinson et al. U.S. Patent No. 6094715 discloses SIMD/MIMD processing synchronization.
41. Rege U.S. Patent No. 5612897 discloses Symmetrically switched multimedia system.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 703-305-5333. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are none for regular communications and none for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is none.

David E. England  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2143

De   
May 1, 2003

  
**DAVID WILEY**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**